

Agenda Item: NRSP Review Committee Report

Presenter: Clarence Watson

The NRSP Review Committee met at the Hilton Atlanta Airport on May 31, 2016. Attending the meeting were Clarence Watson, Doug Buhler, Bret Hess, Dan Rossi, Don Latham, Tom Bewick, and Eric Young. The committee discussed two primary agenda items; the proposal and budget request for NRSP_temp 11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data, and the mid-term review of NRSP 8, Animal Genomics.

1. NRSP_temp11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data

- It was noted that each 1862 region had a presentation on this proposed new NRSP by either a co-PI or the region's administrative advisor involved with this proposal at their spring meeting.
- This concept created lot of positive interest when first suggested as a potential NRSP, but implementation details as presented in the current proposal appear to have too many problems and barriers, and the project as proposed does not appear to be financially sustainable.
- Comments in common across the regions included the following concerns.
 - General consensus that business plan was not well developed and the non-NRSP funding was mostly dependent on unrecovered indirect costs and in-kind salaries.
 - Concern was expressed over what will happen after ARS & NAL commitment ends and if the project would be sustainable.
 - Lot of concern with ICASA as the core data format standard, focus of this format is on crop simulation and may not be appropriate for other types of data sets, alternative data formats should be considered.
 - Project activity does not appear to be well integrated, only indicates that it would be of interest to Extension, and the outreach and communication plan is not well defined.
 - Private entities, consultants, data analysis companies, etc. should be involved with this project, both through participation and funding.
 - From a USDA/NIFA viewpoint, big data is of great interest, this is similar to the plant database project, lots of data in different formats that need to be brought together for further use.
 - Important for Land Grant Universities to be involved in this area collectively, but the proposed structure may not be the most effective and sustainable mechanism
- NRSP-RC Draft Recommendation
 - Reject proposal as presented. Proposal may be resubmitted provided concerns are addressed, however the committee agreed revisions and new information needed was too substantial to be reconsidered this year.

2. NRSP-8 Midterm Review

- Reviews were all excellent, only criticism was lack of attendance by stakeholder representatives at the annual committee meeting during the Plant and Animal Genomics conference. However, this conference does not offer much of interest to them. Administrative Advisors will suggest to project leadership that they consider a separate stakeholder meeting/workshop held every 2-3 years.
- NRSP Review Committee agreed project is progressing well and no changes are needed.